

SINGULARITIES OF THE PROJECTIVE DUAL VARIETY

ROLAND ABUAF *

March 29, 2011

Abstract

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non degenerate projective variety and let $X^* \subset \mathbb{P}^{N*}$ be its projective dual. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space such that $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$ for all $x \in X_{smooth}$ and such that the lines in X meeting L do not cover X . If $x \in X$ is general, we prove that the multiplicity of X^* at a general point of $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ is strictly greater than the multiplicity of X^* at a general point of $L^\perp$. This is a strong refinement of Bertini's theorem.

*Institut Fourier, 100 rue des maths. Saint Martin d'Hères, 38402. E-mail : abuaf@ujf-grenoble.fr

1 Introduction

1.1 Multiplicities of the Projective Dual

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety over the field of complex numbers. Let $X^* \subset \mathbb{P}^{N*}$ be its projective dual, let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space and H be a general hyperplane containing L . Bertini's classical theorem asserts that the tangency locus of H with X is included in $X \cap L$. Very little is known about the hyperplanes whose tangency locus with X lies outside $L \cap X$. It is tempting to think that the multiplicity in X^* of such a hyperplane is strictly larger than the multiplicity of a general hyperplane containing L . The following example shows that this is not true for every L .

Example 1.1.1 Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a smooth hyperplane section of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^5$. The variety X is a ruled surface of degree 3. Its dual is a hypersurface of degree 3 in $\mathbb{P}^{4*}$ which does not contain any points of multiplicity higher than 2. Let L be the exceptional section of X . If $H \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a general hyperplane which contains L , then $H \cap X = L \cup D_1 \cup D_2$, where D_1 and D_2 are two distinct lines on X such that $D_1.D_2 = 0$ and $L.D_i = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. As a consequence, a general point of $L^\perp$ is of multiplicity 2 in X^* . Now, let $D \subset X$ be a line such that $D.L = 1$ and let $x \in D$ such that $x \notin L$. The hyperplane containing L and $T_{X,x}$ is a point of multiplicity exactly 2 in X^* , that is, the multiplicity of a general point of $L^\perp$.

This example shows that, even for general $x \in X$, the multiplicity in X^* of a hyperplane containing L and tangent to X at x may well be equal to the multiplicity of a general hyperplane containing L . Thus, without extra hypotheses on L , it seems hopeless to say something about the multiplicity in X^* of special points of $L^\perp$. For this purpose, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 1.1.2 Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety and let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space. Consider the conormal diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & I(X/\mathbb{P}^N) := \overline{\{(H, x) \in \mathbb{P}^{N*} \times X_{\text{smooth}}, T_{X,x} \subset H\}} \subset \mathbb{P}^{N*} \times \mathbb{P}^N & \\
 \swarrow q & & \searrow p \\
 X^* \subset \mathbb{P}^{N*} & & X \subset \mathbb{P}^N
 \end{array}$$

Figure 1: conormal diagram

Let $F_1, \dots, F_m$ be all the irreducible components of $q^{-1}(L^\perp)$ such that the restrictions:

$$q|_{F_i} : F_i \rightarrow L^\perp$$

are surjective. The **contact locus** of L with X , which we denote by $\text{Tan}(L, X)$, is the union of the $p(F_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

In the case where L is a hyperplane, the contact locus $\text{Tan}(L, X)$ is called the **tangency locus** of L with X . A **tangent hyperplane** to X is a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ such that $\text{Tan}(H, X) \neq \emptyset$.

The contact locus $\text{Tan}(L, X)$ can be thought as the variety covered by the tangency loci of general hyperplanes containing L . In case $L^\perp \not\subset X^*$, this locus is empty. We always have the inclusion:

$$\overline{\{x \in X_{\text{smooth}}, T_{X,x} \subset L\}} \subset \text{Tan}(L, X),$$

but if $\dim(L) < N - 1$ or if X is not smooth, the former locus can be strictly smaller than the latter. Note also that Bertini's theorem says that $\text{Tan}(L, X) \subset L \cap X$. Finally, the contact locus is well behaved. If for a general hyperplane H' containing L , we have $\dim \text{Tan}(H', X) > 0$, then:

$$\text{Tan}(H \cap L, H \cap X) = H \cap \text{Tan}(L, X),$$

for any general hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^N$.

Example 1.1.3 If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is such that X^* is a hypersurface and $L = T_{X,x}$, where $x \in X$ is a general point, then $\text{Tan}(L, X) = x$.

If $X = G(1, 7) \subset \mathbb{P}^{27}$ and $L = \langle T_{X,y_1}, T_{X,y_2} \rangle$, where $y_1, y_2 \in G(1, 7)$ are two general points, then $\text{Tan}(L, X) = \{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset L\}$ is a 4-dimensional quadric, the entry locus of a general point $z \in \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle$.

If $X = G(1, 4) \subset \mathbb{P}^9$ and $L = T_{X,y}$, for any $y \in X$, then $\dim \text{Tan}(L, X) > 0$, whereas $\{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset L\} = \{y\}$.

Definition 1.1.4 Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety, and let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear subspace. The **shadow** of L on X , which we denote by $\text{Sh}_X(L)$, is the closed variety covered by the linear spaces $M \subset X$ such that $\dim(M) = \text{def}(X) + 1$ and $\dim(M \cap \text{Tan}(L, X)) = \text{def}(X)$.

Here $\text{def}(X) = \text{codim}(X^*) - 1$. The shadow is also well behaved. Namely, assume that $\text{def}(X) > 0$, then:

$$\text{Sh}_L(X) = X \Leftrightarrow \text{Sh}_{H \cap L}(H \cap X) = H \cap X,$$

for any general hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Note also that if $x \in X$ is a general point and $L = T_{X,x}$, then $\text{Sh}_L(X) \neq X$, unless X is a linear space. Indeed, if X^* is a hypersurface, this is obvious since $\text{Tan}(T_{X,x}, X) = x$ for general $x \in X$. If X^* is not a hypersurface, take enough general hyperplane sections of X passing through x , so that the corresponding dual is a hypersurface. Now we can state the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1.1.5 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space such that $\text{Sh}_X(L) \neq X$. Then, for all $x \in X_{\text{smooth}}$ such that $x \notin \text{Sh}_X(L)$ and such that $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$, the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ is strictly larger than the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing L .*

If X is the ruled cubic surface considered in example 1.1.1 and L is the directrix of X , one notices easily that $\text{Sh}_X(L) = X$. This shows that the hypothesis $\text{Sh}_X(L) \neq X$ can not be withdrawn. An obvious corollary of theorem 1.1.5 is the following.

Corollary 1.1.6 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space such that there is no line in X which meet L . Then, for all $x \in X_{\text{smooth}}$ such that $x \notin L$ and $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$, the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ is strictly larger than the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing L .*

1.2 Variety of Multisecant Spaces and Duals

We recall the definition of multisecant spaces to a projective variety.

Definition 1.2.1 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety. Let*

$$S_X^{k,0} = \{(x_0, \dots, x_k, u) \in X \times \dots \times X \times \mathbb{P}^N, \dim \langle x_0, \dots, x_k \rangle = k, u \in \langle x_0, \dots, x_k \rangle\},$$

and let S_X^k be its Zariski closure in $X \times \dots \times X \times \mathbb{P}^N$.

Denote by ϕ the projection onto $\mathbb{P}^N$. The variety $S^k(X) = \phi(S_X^k)$ is the k -th secant variety to X .

Theorem 1.2.2 (Terracini's Lemma) *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety, and let $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in X \times \dots \times X$, be general points. If u is general in $\langle x_0, \dots, x_k \rangle$, we have the equality:*

$$\langle T_{X,x_0}, \dots, T_{X,x_k} \rangle = T_{S^k(X),u}.$$

We refer to [Zak93] for a proof.

Definition 1.2.3 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety, and let k be an integer such that $S^k(X) \neq \mathbb{P}^N$. We say that X is **dual k -defective** if $\text{def}(S^k(X)) > t(S^k(X))$, where $t(S^k(X))$ is the dimension of the general fiber of the Gauss map of $S^k(X)$.*

Note that when X is smooth, then dual 0-defectivity is the classical dual defectivity. I don't know if there exist smooth varieties which are dual k -defective for some $k \geq 1$, but which are not dual 0-defective. I believe it would be interesting to find some examples of such varieties.

Note also that the notion of dual k -defectivity seems to be related to that of R_k regularity explored by Chiantini and Ciliberto in [CC10].

A consequence of the main theorem 1.1.5 and Terracini's lemma is the following :

Proposition 1.2.4 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non degenerate, smooth, projective variety. Assume moreover that for all k such that $S^k(X) \neq \mathbb{P}^N$ the variety X is not dual $k - 1$ -defective. Then, for any such k , we have:*

$$S^k(X)^* \subset X_{k+1}^*,$$

where X_{k+1}^* is the set of points which have multiplicity at least $k + 1$ in X^* .

Proof :

► The case $k = 0$ is the definition of $S^0(X)^* = X^*$. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer such that $S^k(X) \neq \mathbb{P}^N$, let $z \in S^{k-1}(X)$ be a general point and H be a general hyperplane containing $T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}$. Let's prove that:

$$\text{Tan}(H, X) = \{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}\}.$$

Let $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ be k general points in $\text{Tan}(H, X)$. Let z' be a general point in $\langle x_0, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle$, by Terracini's lemma we have:

$$T_{S^{k-1}(X),z'} = \langle T_{X,x_0}, \dots, T_{X,x_{k-1}} \rangle.$$

So $z' \in \text{Tan}(H, S^{k-1}(X))$. But by hypothesis, we have $\text{def}(S^{k-1}(X)) = t(S^{k-1}(X))$, which implies that

$$z' \in \overline{\{y \in S^{k-1}(X)_{\text{smooth}}, T_{S^{k-1}(X),y} = T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}\}},$$

so that $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1} \in \{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}\}$.

We now prove that $\text{Sh}_X(T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}) \neq X$. The argument above shows that

$$\text{Tan}(T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}, X) = \{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}\}.$$

Assume that $\text{Sh}_X(T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}) = X$. Then, for all $x'' \in X$, there exists $x' \in \{x \in X, T_{X,x} \subset T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}\}$ such that the line $\langle x'', x' \rangle$ lies in X . But since X is smooth, this line $\langle x'', x' \rangle$ lies in $T_{X,x'}$. So we have $X \subset T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}$, which contradicts the non-degeneracy.

As a consequence of theorem 1.1.5, we get that for a general $x \in X$, the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing $\langle T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}, T_{X,x} \rangle$ is strictly larger than the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing $T_{S^{k-1}(X),z}$. We apply Terracini's lemma to find that $S^k(X)^* \subset X_{k+1}^*$. This concludes the proof. ◀

A stronger result than proposition 1.2.4 has been stated for the first time by Zak in [Zak04], but no proof was given there.

In the second part of this paper we present a proof of theorem 1.1.5, while in the third part we discuss some consequences and open questions.

I would like to thank Bernard Teissier who took time to explain me part of his work and Christine Jost for interesting discussions on Segre classes. I am also especially grateful to Christian Peskine for the (numerous!) discussions we had together. This work owes a lot to his patience. Finally, my thanks go to the referee, who helped me to improve the paper, in many ways.

2 Proof of the Main Theorem

When $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_z(Z) \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ the embedded tangent cone to Z at z and if $H \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is a hyperplane, then $[h]$ is the corresponding point in $(\mathbb{P}^N)^*$.

The proof of theorem 1.1.5 is obvious if $L^\perp \not\subset X^*$. Thus, we only deal with the case where $L^\perp \subset X^*$. Moreover, we can restrict to the case where X^* is a hypersurface. Indeed, assume that X^* has codimension $p \geq 2$. Let $z \in L^\perp$ and $z_x \in \langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ be general points, let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a general $\mathbb{P}^{N+1-p}$ passing through x , let $X' = M \cap X$ and $L' = M \cap L$. We have $\text{Sh}_{X'}(L') \neq X'$ and $\langle T_{X',x}, L' \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^{N+1-p}$. Moreover, we have:

$$(X')^* = \pi_{M^\perp}(X^*),$$

where $\pi_{M^\perp}$ is the projection from $M^\perp$ in $\mathbb{P}^{N^*}$. Since M is general, the map $\pi_{M^\perp}$ is locally an isomorphism around z_x . Hence we have:

$$\text{mult}_z(X^*) = \text{mult}_{z_x}(X^*) \Leftrightarrow \text{mult}_{\pi_{M^\perp}(z)}((X')^*) = \text{mult}_{\pi_{M^\perp}(z_x)}((X')^*).$$

Finally, note that $\pi_{M^\perp}(z)$ is a general point of $(L')^\perp$ and that $\pi_{M^\perp}(z_x)$ is a general point of $\langle L', T_{X',x} \rangle^\perp$. As a consequence, it is sufficient to prove the theorem for X' , whose dual is a hypersurface.

Let's start with a plan of the proof. We assume that X^* has constant multiplicity along a smooth curve $S \subset L^\perp$ passing through $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ and through a general point of $L^\perp$ and we find a contradiction. More precisely:

We prove that the equimultiplicity of X^* along S implies that the family of the tangent cones to X^* at the points of S is flat.

Then, we show that the flatness of the family of the tangent cones to X^* at the points of S leads to the flatness of the family of the conormal spaces of these tangent cones. As a consequence, we have $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|^* \subset L$ for all $s \in S$.

Finally, we relate the tangent cone to X^* at z to the set of tangent hyperplanes to X^* at z (when z is a smooth point of X^* , this is the reflexivity theorem [Kle86]). Using the fact that $\text{Sh}_L(X) \neq X$, we deduce that $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|^* \not\subset L$ for $s \in \langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ and thus a contradiction.

2.1 Normal Flatness and Lagrangian Specialization Principle

Let $S \subset Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be two varieties. We recall some properties of the tangent cones $\mathcal{C}_s(Z)$, $s \in S$ when Z is equimultiple along S .

Definition 2.1.1 *Let $S \subset Z$ be two varieties. We say that Z is **equimultiple** along S if the multiplicity of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{Z,s}$ is constant for $s \in S$.*

Proposition 2.1.2 ([Hir64], cor. 2, p. 197) *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a hypersurface and S a connected smooth subvariety (not necessarily closed) of Z such that Z is equimultiple along S .*

Then, for all $s \in S$, there exists an open neighborhood U of s in S containing s and a closed subscheme $\mathcal{G}(Z) \subset \mathbb{P}^N \times U$ such that the natural projection $p : \mathcal{G}(Z) \rightarrow U$ is a flat and surjective morphism whose fiber $\mathcal{G}(Z)_{s'}$ over any $s' \in U$ is $\mathcal{C}_{s'}(Z)$.

We assume that our theorem is not true, that is for general $x \in X$, the multiplicity of X^* at a general point of $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ is equal to the multiplicity at a general point of $L^\perp$.

Let $[h]$ be a general point of $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$ and let $S \subset L^\perp$ be a smooth (not necessarily closed) connected curve passing through $[h]$ and through a general point of $L^\perp$. We apply the above proposition to X^* and S . Then there exists a scheme $\mathcal{G}(X^*) \subset \mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S$ such that the natural projection $p : \mathcal{G}(X^*) \rightarrow S$ is a flat and surjective morphism whose fiber over $s \in S$ is the tangent cone to X^* at s . Let $\Gamma(X^*) = |\mathcal{G}(X^*)|$. The induced morphism $\Gamma(X^*) \rightarrow S$ is flat and for general $s \in S$ the fiber $\Gamma(X^*)_s$ is exactly $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|$.

Now we study the family of the duals of the reduced tangent cones of X^* at points of S . Applying the Lagrangian specialization principle (see [LT88] and [Kle84]) to $\Gamma(X^*)$ and S , we find the following.

Theorem 2.1.3 *Let $S \subset X^*$ be a smooth curve such that X^* is equimultiple along S . There exists a variety $I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)$ with the following properties.*

i) For general $s \in S$, the following equality holds in $\mathbb{P}^N \times \Gamma(X^)_s$:*

$$I(|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|/\mathbb{P}^{N^*}) = I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s.$$

ii) The morphism $I_S(\Gamma(X^)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S) \rightarrow S$ is flat and surjective,*

iii) For all $s \in S$, the conormal space $I(|\mathcal{C}_s(X^)|/\mathbb{P}^{N^*})$ is a union of irreducible components of the reduced fiber $|I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s|$.*

As a consequence of the above theorem, the image in $\mathbb{P}^N$ of the fiber $I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s$ is $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|^*$, for general $s \in S$. Moreover, for any $s \in S$, the image of the reduced fiber $|I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s|$ contains $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|^*$.

2.2 Polar Varieties and Duals of Tangent Cones

We discuss an extension of the reflexivity theorem proved by Lê and Teissier in [LT88]. The main result of this section will be applied to X^* , so that we restrict our study to the case of hypersurfaces.

Definition 2.2.1 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a reduced and irreducible hypersurface and let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space. The **polar variety** of Z associated to D , which we denote by $P(Z, D)$, is the closure of the set $\{z \in Z_{\text{smooth}}, D \subset T_{Z,z}\}$.*

If $D = \emptyset$ (that is D has dimension -1), then we put $P(Z, D) = Z$.

Remark 2.2.2 Note that if Z is normal, if $u = [u_0, \dots, u_N]$ in an homogeneous system of coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^N$ and f is an equation of Z in this system then $P(Z, u)$ is given by the equations $f = 0$ and $u_0 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_0} + \dots + u_N \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_N} = 0$.

If Z is not normal, then all irreducible components of Z_{sing} which are of dimension $N - 2$ are irreducible components of the scheme defined by $f = 0$ and $u_0 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_0} + \dots + u_N \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_N} = 0$, but they are not irreducible components of $P(X, u)$.

Proposition 2.2.3 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a reduced, irreducible hypersurface and let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a general linear space of dimension k . Then $P(Z, D)$ is empty or of codimension $k + 1$ in Z .*

We state a result of Lê and Teissier which relates the duals of the tangent cones at z of some polar varieties of Z with the tangency locus of $z^\perp$ with Z^* . See [LT88], proposition 2.2.1. For any $z \in Z$, recall that $\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^*)$ is the tangency locus of z along Z^* (see definition 1.1.2).

Theorem 2.2.4 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a reduced and irreducible hypersurface and let $z \in Z$ be a point. We have the following:*

i) The dual of $|\mathcal{C}_z(Z)|$ is a union of reduced spaces underlying (possibly embedded) components of $\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^)$.*

ii) Any irreducible component of $|\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^)|$ is dual to an irreducible component of $|\mathcal{C}_z(P(Z, D))|$ for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$ and for some integer $k \in \{-1, \dots, N - 2\}$.*

Remark 2.2.5 The ii) of the theorem has to be explained. Assume that there is an irreducible component (say T) of $|\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^*)|$ which is not dual to an irreducible component of $|\mathcal{C}_z(Z)|$. Then, there is $k \in \{0, \dots, N - 2\}$ such that for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, we have $z \in P(Z, D)$. Moreover, as D varies in a dense open subset of $\mathbb{G}(k, N)$, the cones $\mathcal{C}_z(P(Z, D))$ have a fixed irreducible component in common whose reduced locus is T^* .

Note also that if $z \in Z_{smooth}$ then for $k \geq 0$ and for D general in $\mathbb{G}(k, N)$, we have $z \notin P(Z, D)$. As a consequence of the ii) of the above theorem, we find $\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^*) = T_{Z,z}^\perp$ for $z \in Z_{smooth}$. This is the way the (obvious corollary of the) reflexivity theorem is often stated.

When $\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^*)$ is irreducible, one may expect $|\mathcal{C}_z(Z)|^* = |\text{Tan}(z^\perp, Z^*)|$. The following example shows that it is not true.

Example 2.2.6 Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be the smooth ruled surface of degree 3 considered in example 1.1.1 and let X^* its dual. The hypersurface X^* has also degree 3 and its singular locus is a $\mathbb{P}^2$, the dual of the exceptional section of X (which we denote by L). Let $C \subset L^\perp = X_{sing}^*$ be the conic corresponding to the hyperplanes which are tangent to X along a ruling of X and let $z \in C$.

The tangent cone $\mathcal{C}_z(X^*)$ is a doubled $\mathbb{P}^3$ so that $|\mathcal{C}_z(X^*)|^* \neq \text{Tan}(z^\perp, X)$. We also note that the scheme-theoretic tangency locus of $z^\perp$ along X is a line with an embedded point. The embedded point is dual to $|\mathcal{C}_z(X^*)|$ and the line is dual to $|\mathcal{C}_z(P(X^*, u))|$, for general $u \in \mathbb{P}^{4*}$.

Before giving the proof of theorem 1.1.5, we need some handy notations.

Notations 2.2.7 Let $f : Y \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-projective morphism between quasi-projective schemes, let $T' \subset T$ be a smooth variety and let $s \in T'$ be any point. Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ be the irreducible components of $f^{-1}(T')$ such that the restrictions:

$$f|_{Y_i} : Y_i \rightarrow T',$$

are surjective. We denote by $\limflat_{\{t \rightarrow s, t \in T'\}} f^{-1}(t)$ the scheme:

$$\limflat_{\{t \rightarrow s, t \in T'\}} f^{-1}(t) = f|_{Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_m}^{-1}(s).$$

If $\dim(T') = 1$ and the Y_i are all reduced then $\limflat_{\{t \rightarrow s, t \in T'\}} f^{-1}(t)$ is the classical flat limit taken along a smooth curve. If $f|_{f^{-1}(T')} : f^{-1}(T') \rightarrow T'$ is flat, then:

$$\limflat_{\{t \rightarrow s, t \in T'\}} f^{-1}(t) = f|_{f^{-1}(T')}^{-1}(s).$$

Proof of the main theorem :

► We recall the setting for the convenience of the reader. The projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is irreducible and non degenerate. The linear space $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is such that $\text{Sh}_X(L) \neq X$ and $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$ for all $x \in X_{smooth}$. We want to prove that for all $x \in X_{smooth}$ such that $x \notin \text{Sh}_X(L)$, the multiplicity in X^* of a general hyperplane containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ is strictly greater than that of a general hyperplane containing L .

The result is obvious if $L^\perp \not\subset X^*$ and we have already seen that we can restrict to the case where X^* is a hypersurface. So we only consider the case where $L^\perp \subset X^*$ and X^* is a hypersurface and we assume that our result is not true. Let $x \in X_{smooth}$ with $x \notin \text{Sh}_X(L)$ and let $[h]$ be a general point in $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle^\perp$. By the results of the previous section, there exists a smooth (non necessarily closed) curve $S \subset L^\perp$ with $[h] \in S$ and a flat morphism:

$$I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S) \rightarrow S,$$

whose fiber $I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s$ is the the conormal space of $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|$, for general $s \in S$. Moreover, the conormal space of $|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|$ is included in $|I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S)_s|$ for all $s \in S$.

The i) of theorem 2.2.4 implies:

$$|\mathcal{C}_s(X^*)|^* \subset p(|q^{-1}(s)|),$$

for all $s \in S$, where p and q are defined in the conormal diagram (see *Figure 1*). Moreover, the flatness of $I_S(\Gamma(X^*)/\mathbb{P}^{N^*} \times S) \rightarrow S$ gives the inclusion:

$$|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^* \subset p(\limflat_{\{s \rightarrow [h], s \in S\}} |q^{-1}(s)|).$$

By definition 1.1.2, we have $p(\limflat_{\{s \rightarrow [h], s \in S\}} |q^{-1}(s)|) \subset \text{Tan}(L, X) \subset L$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an irreducible component of $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ passing through x . By Theorem 2.2.4, there is an integer $k \in \{-1, \dots, N-2\}$ such that $|\mathcal{F}|$ is dual to an irreducible component of $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|$, for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$. Since $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^* \subset L$, we have $k \geq 0$.

Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ be a general point. Duality implies $T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|, z} \subset x_0^\perp$ for some general z in the irreducible component of $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|$ whose reduced locus is $|\mathcal{F}|^*$. Note that $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))| \subset |\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|$. Let $T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|, z}$ be a limit of tangent spaces to $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|$ at z . The point z is general in $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|$, so $T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|, z} \subset T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|, z}$.

As a consequence of this, we have $T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D))|, z} \subset x_0^\perp \cap T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|, z}$. That is:

$$\langle x_0, T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|, z}^\perp \rangle \subset \mathcal{F} \subset X.$$

But we have $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^* \subset \text{Tan}(L, X)$, so that $T_{|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|, z}^\perp \in \text{Tan}(L, X)$ and the above inclusion says that $x_0 \in \text{Sh}_X(L)$. This is a contradiction. ◀

3 Corollaries and Open Questions

We present here some corollaries of theorem 1.1.5 and related open questions.

3.1 Zak's Conjecture on Varieties with Minimal Codegree

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety. We recall, following Zak, that the order of X is $\text{ord } X = \min\{k, S^{k-1}(X) = \mathbb{P}^N\}$ and the k -th secant-defect is $\delta_k = \dim X + \dim S^{k-1}(X) + 1 - \dim S^k(X)$, for all $k \leq \text{ord}(X) - 1$.

In [Zak93], Zak proves an important result related to secant defects.

Theorem 3.1.1 (Zak's Superadditivity Theorem) *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety such that $\delta_1 > 0$. For all $k \leq \text{ord}(X) - 1$, we have the inequality:*

$$\delta_k \geq \delta_{k-1} + \delta_1.$$

The varieties on the boundary are called Scorza varieties, more precisely:

Definition 3.1.2 *An irreducible, smooth, non-degenerate projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is a Scorza variety if the following conditions hold:*

- i) $\delta_1 > 0$ and $N > 2n + 1 - \delta_1$,
- ii) $\delta_k = \delta_{k-1} + \delta_1$ for all $k \leq \text{ord}(X) - 1$,
- iii) $\text{ord}(X) - 1 = \lfloor \frac{\dim X}{\delta_1} \rfloor$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the integral part.

Zak gives in [Zak93] a classification of Scorza varieties.

Theorem 3.1.3 (Classification of Scorza Varieties) *Let X a Scorza variety, then X is one of the following:*

- (i) $X = v_2(\mathbb{P}^n) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(n+3)/2}$ (2^{nd} Veronese) and $\deg(X^*) = n + 1$;
- (ii) $X = \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^n \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(n+2)}$ and $\deg(X^*) = n + 1$;
- (iii) $X = \mathbb{G}(1, 2n + 1) \subset \mathbb{P}(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{C}^{2n+2})$ and $\deg(X^*) = n + 1$;
- (iv) $X \subset \mathbb{P}^{26}$ is the 16-dimensional variety corresponding to the orbit of highest weight vector in the lowest non trivial representation of the group of type E_6 and $\deg(X^*) = 3$.

Zak notices in [Zak04] an important consequence of the assertion $S^k(X)^* \subset X_{k+1}^*$ (where X_k^* is the set of points of multiplicity at least k in X^*). We state his result in the setting where we are able to prove it.

Proposition 3.1.4 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate, smooth, projective variety. Assume that X is not k dual defective for $k < \text{ord}(X) - 1$, then the following inequality holds:*

$$\deg(X^*) \geq \text{ord}(X).$$

Proof:

► With the above assumptions, proposition 1.2.4 implies that there is a point of multiplicity $\text{ord}(X) - 1$ in X^* . Since X is non degenerate, its dual is not a cone and so $\deg(X^*) \geq \text{ord}(X)$. ◀

If X is a Scorza variety then $\deg(X^*) = \text{ord}(X)$. Zak conjectures in [Zak04] the converse statement. We formulate his conjecture in the setting where we can prove the inequality: $\deg(X^*) \geq \text{ord}(X)$.

Conjecture 3.1.5 ([Zak04]) *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, smooth, non-degenerate, projective variety. Assume that X is not k dual defective for all $k < \text{ord}(X)$ and that $\deg(X^*) = \text{ord}(X) + 1$, then X is a hyperquadric or a Scorza variety.*

It is proved in [Zak93], without any hypothesis on the dual defectiveness of X , that smooth varieties with $\deg(X^*) = 3$ and $\text{ord}(X) = 3$ are Severi varieties. In particular, they are Scorza varieties. Note, however, that the smoothness assumption seems to be necessary in his proof. I believe it would be very interesting to have a classification of all varieties whose duals have degree 3.

3.2 Varieties with Unexpected Equisingular Linear Spaces

We come back to our usual setting. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space such that for all $x \in X_{\text{smooth}}$, we have $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$. We have seen in example 1.1.1 that a hyperplane containing the join $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ may have the same multiplicity in X^* as the general hyperplane containing L , even if x is a general point of X . The following definition is convenient to describe this situation.

Definition 3.2.1 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety such that X^* is a hypersurface. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a linear space such that for all $x \in X_{\text{smooth}}$, we have $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^N$. We say that $L^\perp$ is an **unexpected equisingular linear space** in X^* if for all $x \in X_{\text{smooth}}$, the general hyperplane containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ has the same multiplicity in X^* as the general hyperplane containing L .*

The variety in example 1.1.1 is rather special since it is a scroll surface (see [Zak04] for interesting discussions about this variety). It is not a coincidence that the directrix of this variety is an unexpected equisingular linear space in its dual. Indeed, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.2.2 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible, smooth, non-degenerate projective variety such that X^* is a hypersurface. Let $L \subset X$ be a linear space with $\dim(L) = \dim(X) - 1$. Assume that $L^\perp$ is an unexpected equisingular linear space in X^* such that $\text{mult}_{L^\perp}(X^*) = 2$. Then X is the cubic scroll surface in $\mathbb{P}^4$.*

Here $\text{mult}_{L^\perp}(X^*)$ denotes the multiplicity in X^* of a general point of $L^\perp$. Before diving into the proof of theorem 3.2.2, we describe the tangency locus of any point $[h] \subset X^*$, such that $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$.

Proposition 3.2.3 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a smooth, irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety such that X^* is a hypersurface. Let $[h] \in X^*$ be such that $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$. The scheme theoretic tangency locus of H with X is either:*

- i) an irreducible hyperquadric and in this case $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^* = \text{Tan}(H, X)$,*
- ii) the union of two (not necessarily distinct) linear spaces,*
- iii) a linear space with at least one embedded component.*

We postpone the proof of this proposition to the appendix, and we start the proof of theorem 3.2.2.

Proof:

►

Let H be a general hyperplane containing L . We have $H \cap X = L \cup D_H$, where D_H is a divisor such that:

$$D_H \cap L = \text{Tan}(H, X).$$

Let $x \in X$ be a general point and let H_x be a general hyperplane containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$. Then $\text{Tan}(H_x, X)$ contains x and $p(\limflat_{\{[h] \rightarrow [h_x], [h] \in L^\perp\}} q^{-1}([h]))$. By hypothesis, we have:

$$\text{mult}_{[h_x]}(X^*) = \text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2,$$

for all $[h] \in L^\perp$. Proposition 3.2.3 hence implies that the irreducible component of $\text{Tan}(H_x, X)$ containing x , which we denote by R_{H_x} , also contains $p(\limflat_{\{[h] \rightarrow [h_x], [h] \in L^\perp\}} q^{-1}([h]))$. Moreover, we have:

$$p(\limflat_{\{[h] \rightarrow [h_x], [h] \in L^\perp\}} q^{-1}([h])) \subset L,$$

so that

$$\dim R_{H_x} > \dim p(\limflat_{\{[h] \rightarrow [h_x], [h] \in L^\perp\}} q^{-1}([h])),$$

for general $[h] \in L^\perp$. As a consequence $\dim R_{H_x} = n - 1$.

On the other hand, since

$$\text{mult}_{[h_x]}(X^*) = \text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2,$$

for all $[h] \in L^\perp$, we have $|\mathcal{C}_{[h_x]}(X^*)|^* \neq |R_{H_x}|$. We apply again proposition 3.2.3 and we find that $|R_{H_x}|$ is necessarily a linear space of dimension $n - 1$. Thus, we have:

$$\dim \langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle = n + 1.$$

Note that Bertini's theorem implies:

$$R_{H_x} \subset \langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \cap X,$$

for general H_x containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$. As a consequence R_{H_x} is an irreducible component of $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle \cap X$, for general H_x . Thus R_{H_x} does not depend of H_x , for general H_x containing $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$. We deduce that $\langle L, T_{X,x} \rangle$ is tangent to X along a linear space of dimension $n - 1$. By the theorem on tangencies, we have $n - 1 \leq 1$, that is $n = 2$ (obviously, X is not a curve). So $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is a non degenerate surface containing a distinguished line L , such that for general $x \in X$, there is a $\mathbb{P}^3$ tangent to X along a line passing through x and meeting L . This means that X is the projection of a scroll of type $S_{1,d-1}$. By hypothesis, we have $\text{mult}_{L^\perp}(X^*) = 2$, hence proposition 1.6. of [CRS08] implies that $X = S_{1,2} \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.

◀

A Tangency Loci of Points of Multiplicity 2 in the Dual

The goal of this appendix is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.0.4 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a smooth, irreducible, non-degenerate projective variety such that X^* is a hypersurface. Let $[h] \in X^*$ be such that $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$. The scheme theoretic tangency locus of H with X is either:*

- i) an irreducible hyperquadric and in this case $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^* = \text{Tan}(H, X)$,*
- ii) the union of two (not necessarily distinct) linear spaces,*
- iii) a linear space with at least one embedded component.*

Example A.0.5 All three cases can be encountered in Nature.

- i) If $X = v_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset \mathbb{P}^5$, then for all $[h] \in v_2(\mathbb{P}^{2*}) \subset X^*$, we have $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$ and $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ is a smooth conic.
- ii) If X is a complete intersection of large multidegree and large codimension, then there are points $[h_1], [h_2] \in X^*$ such that $\text{mult}_{[h_i]}(X^*) = 2$ and $\text{Tan}(H_1, X)$ is exactly two distinct points, whereas $\text{Tan}(H_2, X)$ is a single double point.
- iii) If X is the cubic scroll of example 1.1.1, then there is a conic $C \subset X^*$, such that for all $[h] \in C$, we have $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$ and $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ is a line with an embedded point.

A doubled linear space will be considered as the union of two (not distinct) linear spaces. By theorem 2.2.4, we know that the irreducible components of $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ are dual to irreducible components of the reduced spaces underlying some $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D_k))$ for general $D_k \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$. In the case where $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) = 2$, the cones $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D_k))$ are rather easy to describe. Let's start with some notations.

Notations A.0.6 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a reduced and irreducible hypersurface. Let $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$ and let f_Z be an equation for Z in some coordinate system of $\mathbb{P}^N$. We denote by $P(f_Z, D)$ the subscheme of $\mathbb{P}^N$ whose ideal is generated by the equations:*

$$u_0 \frac{\partial f_Z}{\partial t_0} + \dots + u_N \frac{\partial f_Z}{\partial t_N},$$

for $u = [u_0, \dots, u_N]$ varying in D .

Let $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$ be a general k -plane. Note that if $\dim(Z_{\text{sing}}) < \dim P(Z, D)$ (that is $\dim Z_{\text{sing}} \leq N - k - 3$), then $P(Z, D) = P(f_Z, D) \cap Z$. In the other case, the irreducible components of maximal dimension of Z_{sing} are irreducible components of $P(f_Z, D) \cap Z$.

Lemma A.0.7 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible and reduced hypersurface. Let $z \in Z$ and let $k \in \{-1, \dots, N-2\}$. Then, for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, we have:*

- 1) $z \notin P(Z, D)$ or,
- 2) $\text{mult}_z P(Z, D) = \text{mult}_z(Z) \cdot \text{mult}_z P(f_Z, D)$, if $\dim(Z_{\text{sing}}^{(z)}) < \dim P(Z, D)$, where $Z_{\text{sing}}^{(z)}$ is an irreducible component of Z_{sing} of maximal dimension passing through z .
- 3) $\text{mult}_z P(Z, D) < \text{mult}_z(Z) \cdot \text{mult}_z P(f_Z, D)$, if $\dim(Z_{\text{sing}}^{(z)}) \geq \dim P(Z, D)$, where $Z_{\text{sing}}^{(z)}$ is an irreducible component of Z_{sing} of maximal dimension passing through z .

Proof:

► If $z \in P(Z, D)$ for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, we will prove the lemma only in the case $P(f_Z, D)$ is smooth at z , for two reasons. The general case is obtained by the same methods, this is only more technical, and we will use the result only in the case $P(f_Z, D)$ is smooth at z .

Moreover if $z \in P(Z, D)$ for general D , we will only concentrate on the case $\dim(Z_{\text{sing}}^{(s)}) < \dim P(Z, D)$. In this case, we have locally around z the equality $P(Z, D) = P(f_Z, D) \cap Z$ for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$. The situation where an irreducible component Z_{sing} containing z is an irreducible component of $P(f_Z, D) \cap Z$ (which is case 3 of the lemma) is dealt with exactly in the same way.

Now, we work locally around z , so that $P(f_Z, D) \cap Z = P(Z, D) \subset \mathbb{A}^N$, for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$. Let $(Z_i)_{i \in I}$ be a stratification of Z such that Z_i is smooth and Z is normally flat along Z_i , for all $i \in I$. Such a stratification exists, due to the open nature of normal flatness (see [Hir64], chapter II). Consider the Gauss map $G : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N*}$. It restricts to a map $G_i : Z_i \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N*}$. We have:

$$P(f_Z, D) \cap Z = P(Z, D) = G^{-1}(D^\perp),$$

so that $P(f_Z, D) \cap Z_i = G_i^{-1}(D^\perp)$, for all i .

Now, we apply Kleiman's transversality theorem to find that for all i and for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, the inverse images $G_i^{-1}(D^\perp)$ are either empty or smooth of the expected dimension.

Let i such that z is in Z_i . If $z \notin G_i^{-1}(D^\perp)$ for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, then $z \notin P(Z, D)$ and we are in the case 1 of the lemma. Otherwise, z is a smooth point of $G_i^{-1}(D^\perp)$, so $T_{P(f_Z, D), z}$ and $T_{Z_i, z}$ are transverse.

Assume that $\text{mult}_z P(Z, D) > \text{mult}_z(Z) \cdot \text{mult}_z P(f_Z, D)$. Since $P(f_Z, D)$ is smooth at z , this implies that $T_{P(f_Z, D), z}$ and $\mathcal{C}_z(Z)$ are not transverse. In particular, the linear spaces $T_{P(f_Z, D), z}$ and $\text{Vert}(\mathcal{C}_z(Z))$ are not transverse

(here $\text{Vert}(\mathcal{C}_z(Z))$ is the vertex of the cone $\mathcal{C}_z(Z)$). But Z is normally flat along Z_i , so we have $T_{Z_i, z} \subset \text{Vert}(\mathcal{C}_z(Z))$ (see thm. 2, p. 195 of [Hir64]). This is a contradiction. $\blacktriangleleft$

As a consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary A.0.8 *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a reduced, irreducible hypersurface. Let $z \in Z$ such that $\text{mult}_z(Z) = 2$ and let $k \in \{-1, \dots, N-2\}$. Then, for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$, we have:*

$$\text{mult}_z P(Z, D) \leq 2.$$

Proof:

$\blacktriangleright$ The result is obvious for $k = -1$, since in this case $P(Z, D) = Z$. Assume that $k \geq 0$ and let $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$ be a general k -plane. Let $u \in D$ be a general point and let π_u be the projection from u . Then, the projections

$$\pi_u|_{P(Z, u)} : P(Z, u) \rightarrow \pi_u(P(Z, u))$$

and

$$\pi_u|_{P(Z, D)} : P(Z, D) \rightarrow \pi_u(P(Z, D))$$

are locally isomorphisms around z . Moreover, we have the equality (see [Tei82]):

$$\pi_u(P(Z, D)) = P(\pi_u(P(Z, u)), \pi_u(D)).$$

As a consequence, it is sufficient to prove the result for $k = 0$. But in this case, this is an obvious application of the above lemma. Indeed, for general $u \in \mathbb{P}^N$, we have:

$$\text{mult}_z P(f_Z, u) = \text{mult}_z(Z) - 1 = 1.$$

$\blacktriangleleft$

We also need the following result.

Proposition A.0.9 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety such that X^* is a hypersurface. Let $[h] \in X^*$ be such that $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ has m components (some of which may be embedded components), then there exists $k \in \{1, \dots, N-2\}$, such that for general $D \in G(k, N)$, we have:*

$$\text{mult}_{[h]} P(X^*, D) \geq m.$$

Proof:

$\blacktriangleright$ We only prove the result when $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ is reduced and pure dimensional. The general case is done using the same ideas, it is only more technical.

Assume that:

$$\text{Tan}(H, X) = Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_m,$$

where the Y_i have the same codimension, say c . Let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^{N^*}$ be a general $\mathbb{P}^{N+1-c}$. Then, we have:

$$\pi_D(P(X^*, D)) = (D^\perp \cap X)^*,$$

where π_D is the projection from D . Moreover, we have $[h] \in P(X^*, D)$ and:

$$\text{Tan}(D^\perp \cap H, D^\perp \cap X) = D^\perp \cap \text{Tan}(H, X).$$

As a consequence, $\text{Tan}(D^\perp \cap H, D^\perp \cap X)$ is a 0-dimensional scheme of degree at least m . In this case, it is clear that:

$$\text{mult}_{\pi_D([h])} \pi_D(P(X^*, D)) \geq m.$$

On the other hand, since D is general, the morphism:

$$\pi_D : P(X^*, D) \rightarrow \pi_D(P(X^*, D))$$

is locally an isomorphism around $[h]$, so that:

$$\text{mult}_{[h]} P(X^*, D) \geq m.$$

◀

Now, we can dive into the proof of A.0.4.

Proof:

► Let $T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m$ be the decomposition of $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ into irreducible components. If $m \geq 3$, then proposition A.0.9 implies that $\text{mult}_{[h]}(X^*) \geq 3$, this is impossible, so that $m \leq 2$.

Assume that $m = 2$. The proof of proposition A.0.9 shows that these two irreducible components are scheme-theoretically linear spaces.

Assume that $m = 1$ and let $k \in \{-1, \dots, N-2\}$ such that T_1 is dual to some irreducible components of the reduced space underlying $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}P(X^*, D)$, for general $D \in \mathbb{G}(k, N)$. By corollary A.0.8, the cone $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}P(X^*, D)$ is either a hyperquadric or a linear space. Assume that it is an irreducible hyperquadric. If $k \geq 0$, we know by theorem 2.2.4 that $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^*$ is the reduced space underlying some embedded component of $\text{Tan}(H, X)$. Taking $q = \dim \text{Tan}(H, X)$ general hyperplane sections of $\text{Tan}(H, X)$ passing through $|\mathcal{C}_{[h]}(X^*)|^*$, we see as in the proof of proposition A.0.9 that for general $D' \in \mathbb{G}(q-1, N)$, we have:

$$\text{mult}_{[h]}(P(X^*, D')) \geq 3.$$

This is impossible by corollary A.0.8. Thus, if $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}P(X^*, D)$ is an irreducible hyperquadric, then $k = -1$, and we are in the case 1 of the proposition.

Finally, if $\mathcal{C}_{[h]}P(X^*, D)$ is a the union of two linear spaces or a unique linear space, then we are in case 2 or 3 of the proposition. This concludes the proof of proposition A.0.4. ◀

References

- [CC10] Luca Chiantini and Ciro Ciliberto. On the dimension of secant varieties. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1267–1291, 2010.
- [CRS08] Ciro Ciliberto, Francesco Russo, and Aron Simis. Homaloidal hypersurfaces and hypersurfaces with vanishing Hessian. *Adv. Math.*, 218(6):1759–1805, 2008.
- [Hir64] Heisuke Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I, II. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 79 (1964), 109–203; *ibid. (2)*, 79:205–326, 1964.
- [Kle84] Steven L. Kleiman. About the conormal scheme. In *Complete intersections (Acireale, 1983)*, volume 1092 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 161–197. Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [Kle86] Steven L. Kleiman. Tangency and duality. In *Proceedings of the 1984 Vancouver conference in algebraic geometry*, volume 6 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 163–225, Providence, RI, 1986. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [LT88] Dũng Tráng Lê and Bernard Teissier. Limites d’espaces tangents en géométrie analytique. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 63(4):540–578, 1988.
- [Tei82] Bernard Teissier. Variétés polaires. II. Multiplicités polaires, sections planes, et conditions de Whitney. In *Algebraic geometry (La Rábida, 1981)*, volume 961 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 314–491. Springer, Berlin, 1982.
- [Zak93] F. L. Zak. *Tangents and secants of algebraic varieties*, volume 127 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993. Translated from the Russian manuscript by the author.
- [Zak04] Fyodor L. Zak. Determinants of projective varieties and their degrees. In *Algebraic transformation groups and algebraic varieties*, volume 132 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 207–238. Springer, Berlin, 2004.